## Application No. Applicant(s) 10/521.588 AKIYAMA ET AL. Interview Summary Examiner Art Unit MICHELE JACOBSON 1704 All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) MICHELE JACOBSON. (3)Ken Higuchi.

(2) Carol Chaney. (4)Srikant Viswanadhawi. Date of Interview: 20 February 2008. Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) Personal (copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e)□ No. If Yes, brief description: Proposed amendments to the claims. Claim(s) discussed: 1-12. Identification of prior art discussed: Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The invention was discussed and proposed amendments were presented. The examiner indicated that a search update would be necessary to determine patentability.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Examiner's signature, if required Attachment to a signed Office action.